	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/766,095	RHEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James W. Rogers, Ph.D.	1618
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) James W. Rogers, Ph.D.	(3)	
(2) <u>Karen Canaan</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 19 December 2006	Time: <u>10:00 AM</u>	·
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	plicant's representative)	
Part I.	,	
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1-32		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT W	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
	•	
		-
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Appli	cant/Applicant's Representative	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner initiated a telephonic interview with Karen Canaan in regards to the status of application 10/766,095, a response was due on 11/25/2006, the examiner left a message. Karen Canaan called the examiner at 1:08 PM and expressed the desire of applicants to abandon this case.